**FACTOM**

**COMMUNITY**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Factom Guides**

**Meeting #19-**02

**201**9**-**01**-**07

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and time of meeting** | 2019-01-07, 20:00 UTC |
| **Date minutes drafted** | 2019-01-07 |
| **Date minutes approved** |  |
| **Organization/Team** | Factom Guides |
| **Attendees** | Factom inc (Brian Deery), Canonical ledgers (Sam), DBGrow Inc (Julian), The 42ND Factoid AS (Tor) |
| **Members not in attendance** | Centis BV (Niels Klomp) |
| **Other attendees** |  |
| **Meeting Leader** | Factom Incorporated (Brian) |
| **Meeting Secretary** | The 42ND Factoid AS (Tor) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 0** | * **Roll Call** * **Approval of minutes from previous meetings on 201**9-01-02 |
| **Discussion** |  |
| **Conclusion** | 4 Guides in attendance, Centis BV (Niels Klomp) is not in attendance.  Meeting minutes approved. |
| **Follow up** | Sam will upload approved meeting minutes to the document management system at Factomize. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 1** | Factom Community Grant round #19-01 (Sam & Tor) |
| **Discussion** | Sam: We have this grant round coming up that we need to start this month. Me and Tor are taking lead on this, and it will be a evolutionary process. There was a lot of discontent last time, and we will amend a few of the items from last time.  Tor and I have created a draft document, and we will finish it during the next few days.  Brian: Does anyone have anything to add at this stage?  Tor:  Sam: I would like to add that it has been a few very busy weeks and months with multiple documents being ratified, and that this has made discussion about grants take the back seat a bit. It doesn’t mean that we cannot continue discussing and improving the process, we can do that in parallel while doing the next round.  Brian: I think end of january/beginning of february seems doable.  Sam: That’s about 2 weeks shifted from the cadence we were aiming for (3 months).    Sam: I did the math last week, and it looked like it will be around the same amount as last time; around 130 000 Factoids. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject 2** | Upcoming releases (Brian) |
| **Discussion** | Brian: The last time we talked was just 3 or so working days ago, and some progress has been made, but maybe Paul Snow would be the best one to talk about this one? Paul, if you are in the audience would you care to give us an update?  Paul Snow: I can give you an update. We are continuing to test and beat on the next release. We have still a number of issues that we are concerned about. One is the fact that a couple of the computers that you ran over the holidays had a panic that was indicative of falling out of step with the network. Factoid balance insufficient bug that we saw in the past. We are looking at that as well as continuing to look at the hashing of the state to allow faster boot times that we found a few things that made us uncomfortable about that code. So, I took a bit of a deviation in looking at performance improvements at booting that fell through the cracks, and seeing if there are some cheap things we can do to make it better. All in all we are still working to get this release out and we are still being stymied by some things we are finding in testing unfortunately.  I should point out that the holidays impacted us more than the bugs, as not to leave you with the expectations that we worked hard over the holidays. We did take some time off.    Paul: Yes I would agree with that. The codebase that we are working with right here has a number of authors, and is a bit intractable and we would like to simplify and eliminate a lot of it. As soon as we can get this release out and stable I absolutely want to focus on simplification and refactoring. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 3 | Upcoming ANO election round (Julian) |
| Discussion | Julian: Me and Nic (DBGrow employee) has been working on this iteration. The biggest item is that we will be including ANOs in voting rather than just guides. Determining that process is a big to-do. There is a few things that we should throw up polls for to get consensus. How to we weigh guide vs ANO votes for example? So far we have developed this document only… We also need to prepare some adjustments for Doc 001 because it outlines how ANOs are voted in. If we are changing that we need to ratify some amendments to Doc 001 in the next few weeks.  Sam: Do you have a rough timeline where you think this can fit in well?  Julian: When the election round could fit in well?  Sam: ANO Election round, yeah.  Julian: I think we roughly agreed…. I don’t remember.. A month after the grant round, approximately… Announced a week after the voting for the grant round, and then the actually elections would be held something like a month after.  Sam: Keep in mind that it looks like we will have guide elections in March if the current guide process is ratified.  Julian: The other question is how many ANOs we will be voted in. So far we have 7 left before that magic number 32… So maybe 4 this round, and 3 the next round might well.  Sam: There is also the approach of setting a higher threshold and let everyone in instead of setting a max amount.  Julian: That might provide more promising results. But setting that bar might be hard to set to get the desired results.  Tor: We should allow for a mandatory period on the testnet as well (1 month?) It was discussed after the last ANO round due to the problems we saw during onboarding...  Julian: Yes, we’ll have to come back to the timeline for that.    Julian: The main consideration here is that once we get past 33 ANOs that 33 ANO that is introduced will have to be introduced with only one server, and the 34th server will take that server from another ANO. So that bring a whole host of governance issues as well as social issues to work through, so the reason of doing lower numbers going forward is to provide ourselves with more time to sort out these issues.    Brian: I guess we will have a lot of ideas and discussion at that point, but that will be after the next round. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject 4 | Resignation of Syncroblock (Brian) |
| Discussion | <https://factomize.com/forums/threads/syncroblock-resignation.1459/>  Brian: Syncroblock was onboarded as an ANO with a set of expectations that they had laid out for themselves, and it turns out that they didn’t quite have the time to deal with the expectations they had set out for themselves. The ANO removal process had been started and was basically on its way to be put up to the Standing parties to determine if Syncroblock was still performing up to expectations. Instead of following through with that process they had decided to resign as an ANO. So that happened over the past week or so, and at this point they are no longer building the blockchain and we wish them well in their future endeavours and thank them for their service and looking forward to having more enthusiastic participants that the hole that syncroblock has left will allow to be filled in the next election round.  Paul: This process is always contentious by definition. And I believe it was a bit painful. There is a lot of sides to all of these types of conflicts, and I just urge people not to burn bridges unnecessarily, and mend bridges where possible. This offboarding of syncroblock did occur over a 6 month period where expectations were not met due to a lack of resources. I’m just urging that we should be as friendly and including community as possible while still watching for the best interest of the protocol.  Sam: I 100% agree with that. I’ll go ahead and say that Canonical Ledgers was the ANO that initiated the motion, and anyone who wants to discuss it can do it with me after the guide meeting. I have nothing against them it’s about what is good for the protocol. I was one of the few people who actually called him up and talked to him… They did not live up to the expectations set by themselves, maintaining the servers etc, and we in CL decided that we felt it was best for them to resign, so we initiated the motion.  I 100% agree that we should try to keep things as cordial and civil as possible.  Paul: If I may add. I agree with you completely. I just… In the backrush of the process and we have executed what is an action required to protect the protocol, there is no need for further contention, and that is all I’m saying. I should also point out that I offered to reach out and talk to them, and they did not find it necessary to talk to me, but that would be my message as well. We do what we have to do, but there is no requirement for us to retain any hard feelings.  Sam: I 100% agree Paul. Thank you.    Brian: I agree. We will have an interesting future, and I am looking forward to experiencing that future with all you guys. |
| Conclusion |  |
| Follow up |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 5 | **Follow up: tasks from last meeting / upcoming tasks** |
| **Discussion** | **Sam:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Conclude Guide Process ratification (unless community extends it) * Finalize dates for Grant round * Release tentative dates for ANO application round   (Text from previous meeting ends)  This week:   * Finish grant round document and facilitate ratification process * Look at what amendments are required to Doc 001 for Guide Process document   **Tor:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * + ANO application round   + Grant Round   + Ratify guide process   (Text from previous meeting ends)  Not much to add after Sam. He and I have been working on the same stuff the past week, and will continue to do so next week with grant/ANO-application round. I will also work with Niels on the Bug Bounty program funded the past Grant round.  **Julian:**  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Focus on the next ANO Application round, determining weighting between ANOs/Guides for voting, etc * Finalize and announce grant round dates   (Text from previous meeting ends)   * Hope to finish this ANO round document, maybe start looking at creating updates to Doc 001.   Brian**:**  **(Text from previous meeting begins)**   * Continue on 6.1.1 * Continue on Wallet updates with identity and encryption * Continue with community docs   **(Text from previous meeting ends)**  Niels:  (Text from previous meeting begins)   * Been busy with private matters, so less than usual work on Factom this week. Worked on the Factom Improvement Protocol (FIP), and asked the core committee members to comment on it. * Next week: Next grant application rounds and continue work on FIP.   (Text from previous meeting ends)  (Niels not present in the meeting.) |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up (until next meeting)** |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subject** 6 | **Open floor** |
| **Discussion** | David Chapman:  Last night the first Factom Protocol Daily Update was sent out via the forum. It is an aggregate of all the daily communication that is deemed important, so hopefully all of you received it that and it looked ok. I would like to ask anyone that is interested to become editors of the newsletters. It’s a small but important job.… I would especially like to invite the Guides to do so, that way you can add information a day or two early that you want to go out, for example about upcoming guide meetings etc. |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **Follow up** |  |

Meeting adjourned at 20:46 UTC.